

Application No. 09/965,263  
Amdt. dated Jul. 8, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 9, 2003

### REMARKS

After entry of the Amendments, Claims 1-2 and 4-16 will remain in the Application. Claim 3 will have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11 and 15-16 will have been amended. Claims 9, and 12-14 will be unchanged.

### Drawings

The Applicant notes the Examiner's indication that the drawings filed are acceptable for examination, subject to correction of informalities noted on form PTO-948. The Applicant will supply new, corrected drawings when required by the Examiner.

### Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 2 and 11, as well as the claims that depend therefrom, for certain informalities.

The Applicant has amended the claims to address the issues raised by the Examiner, as follows:

1) The Examiner has suggested that the term "elongated linear housing" be replaced with "elongated housing" to avoid confusion. The Applicant has maintained the term "housing" throughout the claims, in a manner that the Applicant believes overcomes the Examiner's objection.

2) The Examiner has suggested that the term "housing support" be used consistently throughout the claims. The Applicant has made this change.

3) The Examiner has identified confusing language at claim 1, lines 8 and 9 and has suggested alternative language. The Applicant has added a comma to the phrase so that it reads as follows:

"the bottom and top surface portions of the housing supports respectively engaging, in mating slide fit relationship, the bottom and top walls to support the bottom and top walls in fixed spaced relation to each other".

4) The Applicant has amended claim 2, line 1, along the lines suggested by the Examiner.

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 08 2003

Application No. 09/965,263  
Amtd. dated Jul. 8, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 9, 2003

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to claims 3-10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim(s), but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 3. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 4-7, and 9-10 now depend from allowable claim 1, as amended.

The Applicant has amended claim 8 to include the limitations of claim 1 as originally filed. The Applicant notes that original claim 8 did not depend from objected base claim 3, as indicated by the Examiner, but did depend from rejected claim 1. The Applicant has reviewed the references cited as prior art and believes that claim 8, as amended, is patentable over the prior art references.

The informalities of claim 11 have been addressed as indicated above and should be allowable. Claims 12-16 now depend from allowable claim 11, as amended.

Prior Art Made of Record and Not Relied Upon

The Applicant has reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon, as noted in the pending office action, but does not believe any of the references so cited to anticipate or suggest the invention as now claimed.

The Applicant believes that the instant application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes there are other unresolved issues in this case, Applicants' attorneys of record would welcome a call at (502)584-1135 to discuss such remaining issues.

DATE: July 8, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey A. Haeberlin, Reg. No. 40,630  
Direct Phone: (502)625-2753  
Direct Fax: (502)588-1932  
MIDDLETON REUTLINGER  
401 S 4<sup>th</sup> Ave Ste 2500  
Louisville, Kentucky 40202  
Firm Phone: (502)584-1135  
Firm Fax: (502)561-0442

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 08 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800